

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3-4, 10, and 12-13 have been amended as shown at pp. 2-5 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 3, 4 12 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C §112**

Claims 3, 4 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3-4 and 12-13 have been amended to cure any deficiencies related to this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen, *et al.* (US #6,507,845 B1) in view of Sluiman, *et al.* (US #6,098,072). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cohen, *et al.* in further view of Sluiman, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

The subject invention relates to controlling access to computer objects based on the computer space from which access will occur. For example, access rights to a computer file can be based on user and location, such Users A and B are allowed, and only from Networks X and Y. If User C tried to access the computer file, access would be denied and if User A tried to access the computer file from Network Z, access would be denied. In particular, Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 10) recites *one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object from one or more computer locations and at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object for one or more computer users.*

Cohen, *et al.* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Cohen, *et al.* teaches a system for managing collaboration amongst a group of users involved in a task. The Office Action contends that Figure 10 teaches access control for users and computer locations. However, Figure 10 describes two windows, one showing a list of documents and the other showing a list of user involved in the task and their activity on each document. Neither window shows any control of access to documents from either a computer location or a computer user. Cohen, *et al.* does discuss a sharing function which allows a user to request that one or more other users share a document so that they can work on it together. However, this function does not determine whether the one or more other users have access to the document themselves, without the share session. Cohen, *et al.* fails to discuss control of access to documents. It appears that there is an underlying assumption in the prior art that all users associated with a task have access to all documents associated with the task. Furthermore, Sluiman, *et al.* also fails to teach or suggest control of access to documents. Rather, Sluiman, *et al.* teaches a system for providing alternate directory views of source code files in a file directory system to accommodate the differing requirements of users of those files. This provides users with a way to view the files in a directory hierarchically, flat, or in some other view, while maintaining the original directory structure in which they were saved. Therefore, Cohen, *et al.* and Sluiman, *et al.* alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to *access to the computer object from one or more computer locations* and at least

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

one of the computer spaces corresponding to *access to the computer object for one or more computer users*.

In view of at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that Cohen, *et al.* in view of Sluiman, *et al.* does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10 (and claims 2-9 and 11-18 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION


The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP688US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



David W. Grillo  
Reg. No. 52,970

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731